

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Examiner's Action of September 8, 2005, has been received and reviewed by counsel for Assignee. In that Action claims 1-5 were presented for examination. All claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over *Kung* (U.S. 5,241,594) in view of an article by *Lamport*.

By this response counsel has canceled all pending claims and submits herewith new claims 6-10. These new claims are written with a view toward clarifying the distinctions between Applicants' invention and the prior art.

*Kung* teaches a system having a multiple log-on procedure in which when a user desires to use a particular computer, the log-in requests are processed by accessing a stored file that contains the user's ID and encrypted password. If the user log-in matches, then the system accesses the remote computer and logs the user onto that computer. Thus, in effect, a single server is controlling access to other computers upon which presumably sensitive data is stored.

Applicants' system provides a different approach than *Kung*. Applicants' system provides a log-in authentication method that reduces traffic and enables concurrent utilization of one account by multiple persons. Thus, in contrast to *Kung*, multiple users may log into a single remote computer using appropriately determined passwords to access sensitive information. In *Kung*, the users do not use the same sensitive information at the same time because the host (13) in *Kung* maintains account information with one password per user. Thus, even if *Kung* is combined with *Lamport*, multiple communications are required between the server 12 and the remote host 13 to send the user ID and the password 48 when a group of users request serves from the same remote host 13.

Furthermore, Applicants' invention as now claimed calls for the business system to maintain a list of passwords and to send the selected password to a particular authorized user. This is not taught by *Kung*. In particular, *Kung* does not return the password to the user, but instead connects the user to the remote computer. Furthermore, as called for in the last subparagraph of independent claim 6, *Kung* does not teach nullifying the password after a single use.

For these reasons the new claims 6-10 are believed to patentably distinguish the cited *Kung* reference, taken by itself or in combination with the *Lamport* article.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at 650-324-6303 (direct).

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Colwell  
Reg. No. 27,431

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 415-576-0300  
RCC: mks  
60651959 v1